



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT WORKS ON THE LEXICON AND GRAMMAR OF HEBREW-ARAMAIC

מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה חברו אליעזר בן־יהודה ירושלמי

Thesaurus totius Hebraicitatis et veteris et recentioris. Auctore ELIESER BEN IEHUDA, Hierosolymitano. Schönebergi apud Berolinum in aedibus Prof. G. LANGENSCHIEDTL. I (א — בעתה), II (הפקעה — ב"פ), III, parts 1-5 (ורח — הפקעה). pp. 1396.

Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.

Mit Einschaltung und Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der massoretischen Randbemerkungen und einem deutsch-hebräischen Wortregister. Von Dr. phil. u. theol. EDUARD KÖNIG, ordentlichem Professor und Geh. Konsistorialrat in Bonn. Leipzig: DIETRICH'SCHE VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG (THEODOR WEICHER), 1910. pp. x + 665.

Vorstellung und Wort "Friede" im Alten Testament. Von Dr. Lic.

WILHELM CASPARI, in Erlangen. Gütersloh: C. BERTELSMANN, 1910. pp. 168.

THE line of demarcation between biblical and post-biblical Hebrew is a fluid one. Mishnic Hebrew projects into the canon, just as biblical Hebrew is met with in Mishnah and Talmud. Saadya was the first to collect in a lexidion a list of biblical hapax legomena which may be explained by the aid of post-biblical Hebrew. When due deduction is made of Scriptural reminiscences in the Mishnah (e. g. Peah 2, 2 = Isa. 7, 25; 4, 9 = Levit. 2, 2; Kelim 1, 9 = Joel 2, 17; Sukkah 5, 4 comp. I Chron. 25, 1; Abot 4, 18 = Prov. 3, 5) and the conscious imitation of biblical style (sporadically in prose, as in the historical baraita Kiddushin 66a,

where observe the 1 consecutive six times; more frequently in poetic (païtanic) pieces, comp. Megillah 6a, Moed kaṭan 25b, Ketubbot 104a, Abodah zarah 24b, Abot derabbi Nathan 38; then in maxims, in the apocalyptic mishnah Soṭah 9, 15, in liturgical pieces with their *parallelismus membrorum* and the like), there is imbedded in the tannaitic literature much of the Old Hebrew vocabulary for which there was accidentally no room in the Scriptures. Scriptural Hebrew is also found in the Hebrew Sirach and in the undoubtedly pre-Christian sectarian document published by Schechter. Not that Scriptural Hebrew persisted in tannaitic times in its pristine purity; but the development from the golden era of the language to its silver stage was a natural one and is witnessed already in the canon. The Mishnic Hebrew is naturally colored by the Aramaic vernacular, but Aramaisms are met with in the Bible some of which ascend into early times; for in the process of mixture—if mixture it be called—not only chronological sequence but also local and dialectal forces must be studied. In the days of Rabbi, Hebrew was still a spoken language in some nooks and corners, as on the other hand the subject-matter of the tannaitic literature brought about a necessary syntactical change as well as an enrichment in the line of particles. So much is certain that the student of the biblical Hebrew finds it necessary to overstep the limits of the canon for the elucidation of the language of the canon itself. The current great lexica of the Talmud and Midrashim inconveniently enough combine the Hebrew and Aramaic material together; moreover the connection with the biblical stage is lost. This evil is now obviated by Ben Iehuda's *Thesaurus*. This is one feature of the work. Another equally important side to the gigantic work is the record made (in foot-notes) of the native lexicographical expositions of the mediæval period. Of the mediæval Hebrew lexicographers none is as important as Ibn Janah who is quite modern and whose views deserve to be consulted on every point. Moreover, an insight into the current (traditional?) exegesis of the Jews is gained by consulting the use to which biblical words and phrases have been put in the productions of the great Spanish poets who were themselves no mean exegetes. For with them the third period of the Hebrew sets in; I prefer to call it Neo-Hebrew, while the tannaitic

language should be designated as late Hebrew. In so far as Neo-Hebrew became the vehicle of rhymed poetry in Arabic meter it meant a conscious reversion to the Hebrew of the Scriptures. It is Rapoport who has shown (Introduction to *Parḥon*) how in the days of Judah Halevi and his fellow-singers Hebrew was ill suited to the dialectic and philosophico-scientific genre of literature; how when the Neo-Hebrew muse had taken marvelous flights, the very same poets reverted to the vernacular when they had to write on philology or philosophy. It is the merit of the great translators to have created the Hebrew prose; to what extent the rich treasures of Arabic were drawn upon is well known; it is equally known how many of the "innovations" became naturalized, a permanent fixture for all times. Ben-Iehuda has excerpted the mediæval poetic and prose works in Hebrew, and his labor, at present unique, reveals at once the richness of this later stage of Hebrew. There is hardly a scientific term for which there does not exist a good Hebrew equivalent, whether a new content has been put into old material or a new vocabulary coined *ad hoc*. Another reversion to biblical Hebrew occurred at the end of the eighteenth century after the Hebrew of the mediæval period had been debased largely through the subject-matter of the latter centuries which was mainly halakic. I am speaking of prose Hebrew, for poetry, though meter and form changed in the Occident, moved largely in the channels of the older standards. The Measefim ushered in the fourth period of the Hebrew, the modern Hebrew, the language of esthetic and popular practical literature. The modern European languages naturally exerted a certain measure of influence, and to that extent Hebrew lost I will not say in purity—for purity is a standard for pedants—but rather in its organic native make-up. With the transition of the center of gravity for Hebrew culture to the Orient, particularly to Palestine, where the exigencies of circumstances—Palestine represents a conglomerate of the Jewries of the world—make imperatively for the cultivation of Hebrew as a living language, Hebrew is returning to its ancient home and is brought once more into contiguity with its sister dialects, Arabic specifically. In view of what is really happening in Palestine even the philologist will hesitate to subscribe to Nöldeke's pronouncement (article "Semitic Lan-

guages," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, p. 622b) that "the dream of some Zionists, that Hebrew—a would-be Hebrew, that is to say—will again become a living, popular language in Palestine, has still less prospect of realization than their vision of a restored Jewish empire in the Holy Land." Words belonging to the newest coinage and described as actually in use either in the latest literature or in living popular speech are marked as such in Ben Iehuda's *Millon*. A few examples may not be out of place. אֶבְחָמִין "oxygen," אֶבְחָנֶק "hydrogen," אֶבְחָמִים "nitrogen," אֶבְחָנִיָּה (= Arabic *hajariyyah*) "macadamized road," אֶבְחָן (Aramaic for בְּרִיל "tin"; on the principle of utilizing doublets, hence a principle of economy, then introduced for) "zinc"; אֶבְחָן (from the Aramaic אֶבְחָן but אֶבְחָן would be more correct) "lead pencil"; אֶבְחָן "polite," אֶבְחָנוּת "politeness" (from the Arabic); אֶבְחָנָה "flirt," אֶבְחָנִים "flirting"; אֶבְחָן "cyclist," אֶבְחָנִים (but "wheel" is אֶבְחָן, not אֶבְחָן) "bicycle"; אֶבְחָן "radium"; אֶבְחָל "cancer" (אֶבְחָל used by Ibn Tibbon); אֶבְחָן (comp. נֶתְאֶבְחָן) "brown"; אֶבְחָנוּת (the vocalization is open to criticism) "art of painting"; אֶבְחָן "fashion"; אֶבְחָן "ash-gray"; אֶבְחָן (comp. Arabic *kadaḥa* "strike fire") "revolver"; אֶבְחָן "doll"; אֶבְחָן (comp. נֶבְחָן in the Mishnah) "gypsum"; אֶבְחָנוּת "coquetry"; אֶבְחָן "kindergarten teacher"; אֶבְחָן (comp. Aramaic) "waiter"; אֶבְחָנוּת "interest (*Interesse*)"; אֶבְחָן (comp. Arabic) "ministry"; אֶבְחָן "rose color"; אֶבְחָן (comp. Aramaic) "transparent"; אֶבְחָן (comp. Aramaic) "singer (*chanteuse*). The proportion of new words is after all a small one. It shows how when the total of the Hebrew vocabulary belonging to all ages and coming from all corners has been collected—a vertiable "gathering of the dispersed"—there is but little occasion for innovation. Words with which we have been familiar in the latter-day literature are proved to have been current as far back as the tannaitic times when foreign (principally Greek and Latin) words became naturalized in Hebrew and Hebraized in form. For this is the sign of a living language that it can assimilate foreign words and make them available for new derivatives after the fashion of Hebrew. An unassimilated foreign word remains barren; but a word naturalized and sub-

mitted to the Hebrew cast becomes itself the fruitful parent of new formations. Ben-Iehuda's industry is simply marvelous. What is done for other languages by learned academies and societies working together has been accomplished by the devotion of a single scholar. There will probably be found omissions; I have myself come across a few examples. But where so much is given it is gratuitous to cavil because more is not offered. Ben-Iehuda is at home in the whole range of Semitic philology. He has perused modern grammars and articles scattered in learned magazines. He has an opinion of his own where a difference of views obtains among grammarians and lexicographers. His etymological excursions will prove valuable. What he has to say on the vocalizations of the names of the consonants ("alef," "gimel," "dalet," etc.) will command itself to judicious scholars, although it must be granted that for such words antedating the *nikkud* the traditional vowel symbols adjusted to a different phonetic principle should not be used. Elsewhere, likewise, Ben-Iehuda has made errors in the vocalization, not to mention misprints. Misprints abound also in the English. On p. 970a, footnote, read "gemmis" for "genus." The author should use more caution in the future. It is also to be regretted that the author has not followed the Oxford Gesenius (and the mediæval Hebrew lexica) in placing derivatives under the root, instead of arranging them alphabetically. Perhaps this deficiency can be made good in an appendix. An introduction is to accompany the work upon its completion which will deal with the history of the language in all its phases and an outline of Hebrew grammar. Ben-Iehuda's *Millon* should be in the hands of every student of the Scriptures and every teacher of Hebrew. It should be a matter of honor for all Jews who love their national tongue to support the author financially, that is by subscribing to the great work now slowly but steadily going through the press.

Professor König's Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon to the Old Testament comes as a fit sequel to a series of works by the same author dealing with the grammar of biblical Hebrew and extending over a period of thirty-seven years (a dissertation on "thought, sound, and accent as the three factors of language-making demonstrated in Hebrew" appeared in 1874 when the author was teaching

school at Döbeln; the monumental Hebrew Grammar in three parts, "Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache mit komparativer Berücksichtigung des Semitischen überhaupt," was published in 1881. 1895. 1897; in 1900 appeared his work on "stylistics, rhetoric, and poetics of the biblical literature," a subject hitherto treated only casually but never on so comprehensive and thorough a scale; the next year was given to the publication of a monograph setting forth the place of Hebrew in the Semitic group of languages, "Hebräisch und Semitisch, Prolegomena und Grundlinien einer Geschichte der semitischen Sprachen"; a short Hebrew Grammar for beginners saw the light in 1908). The chief feature of this Dictionary is that it sums up the author's linguistic studies in connection with the biblical languages, preeminently the Hebrew; as a sort of index to König's Grammar (including the Rhetoric) it will prove more than welcome to students of the Hebrew Scriptures. There is no scarcity of modern Hebrew lexica. English-speaking scholars have their Oxford Gesenius which in the opinion of the writer is the best work of its kind in any European language, though the Germans will persist in using the latest editions of the German Gesenius which because of its up-to-date bibliographical references cannot be dispensed with even by those who possess the English edition. The merits of the English Gesenius consist chiefly in the syntactical matter which is to my knowledge nowhere presented with that fulness of detail. The independent work by Stade-Siegfried had pointed the way in that direction; its basic principle—the elucidation of word-meanings from the Hebrew itself—was a check upon the extravagances of the comparative method which pervaded the earlier German editions of Gesenius—one need only think of the scathing criticism from the pen of Lagarde directed against the "Staatsräte," not to speak of Fürst's etymologies which were really beneath criticism. As a matter of fact, the cognate languages cannot boast of as thorough a range of lexicographical works as does the Hebrew (and biblical Aramaic). Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus* and Dillmann's *Ethiopic Lexicon* come perhaps nearest the ideal; the Assyrian Dictionaries operate with the method of elucidating the language on its lexical side from within, quite after the fashion of Stade

and Siegfried for the Hebrew. But we possess no Arabic Lexicon worthy of the name. For Lane is merely a collection of excerpts from the native lexicographers; useful as it certainly is as far as it goes, a Thesaurus of the Arabic tongue on modern lines and with first-hand recourse to the literature is still a desideratum. Whatever of comparative matter adorns the Hebrew dictionaries—it is largely ornamental—comes from dictionaries, and not from the literature, and the element of doubt attaches to it throughout. No wonder that in the recent lexicographical works the comparative “Beiwerk” is signalized as occupying a less important place by the very script in which it is printed or by the parentheses within which it is placed. König has not withstood the temptations of registering the comparative evidence, and with a view to students less familiar with the cognate languages all such matter is transliterated, a custom hitherto adopted for Assyrian only. What constitutes the chief characteristic of König’s work, however, is the attention to the semantic development on lines worked out fully in the “*Stylistik*.” Another point is the registration of difficult grammatical forms in alphabetic order. The linguistic matter of the masoretic glosses (such as appear in the manual editions of the Bible) is equally entered. The Aramaic of the Bible is treated in an appendix, with due regard to the Egyptian finds. To students who operate with König’s grammatical works—and for an exhaustive mastery of the niceties of Hebrew grammar they should be in the hands of all earnest students of the Scriptures—the Dictionary will be indispensable. No well appointed University or College library should be without them; no “seminar” work should be attempted unless all of them are within easy reach. For private study the student who can ill afford the expense of costly text-books will in probability, at least in English-speaking countries, possess himself of the Oxford Gesenius. For be it said with no disparagement to König’s Dictionary: it will prove useful mainly by the side of his other works of which it is a summary, while the other lexica, though in themselves more costly, can be used to advantage in connection with any Hebrew grammar. The professional scholar, the academic teacher for instance, must perforce have them all on his shelves; not the least

reason being the full discussion of mooted problems which he will find in this latest Hebrew Dictionary, that by König.

Caspari's little book is a monograph on the word "Peace" (שלום). "On earth peace," with this expression the advent of the Messianic era is signalized in the song of the heavenly host in Luke 2, 14. The message has its roots in Judaism. The author works backwards from the Hellenistic writings through the prophets and Psalms to the earlier pre-exilic seers until he reaches the prophet of peace *par excellence*, Isaiah. Two chapters are then devoted to the usage of the verb שלם in the Old Testament and in the cognate dialects and to שלום in proper names and in the formulae of salutation. The last chapter is in the nature of a summary in which the development of the meaning of the Hebrew word for "peace" is sketched. At first an expression for security based on compacts between individuals, it gradually transcends the private connotation by assuming the signification of public safety and welfare within the nation; with the rise of the monarchy and the consolidation of the nation war becomes a national duty concurred in by the prophets, though it cannot be said that empire building was part of the politics of David and his successors; Isaiah is the first to place himself in opposition to the martial spirit of the dynasty by proclaiming the message of the cessation of warfare between nations and the advent of the era of universal peace. "Peace" now assumes a religious signification, and Psalm 85 is its highest expression. God, the author of peace, speaks peace unto his people, and to his saints. His salvation is nigh them that fear him. Peace is an inward harmony with God and righteousness. "Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Just as the programme of universal peace among nations is the precursor of ideas which are seriously taken up in our own day, so is the incorporation of peace in the scheme of salvation a preparation for the Gospel. So far the author whose little study has above all the merit that it is readable throughout proving that even lexicographers need not be the dryasdusts that they are currently held to be.

Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Von THEODOR NÖLDEKE. Strassburg: Verlag von KARL J. TRÜBNER, 1910. pp. viii + 240.

WHILE this work is not specifically devoted to Hebrew-Aramaic, it is certainly inclusive of it. Comp. the Hebrew-Aramaic indexes on pp. 106 f., 200 f. Hebrew-Aramaic loanwords in Ethiopic are discussed on pp. 32-46; the two languages are dealt with along with Arabic and Ethiopic in the essays on words with counter-sense (*addād*), nouns from biconsonantal roots, interchange of initial *n* and *w* or hamza, interchange of initial *w* or hamza and *y*, participles and adjectives from "hollow roots" (pp. 67-216). But even in the essay which heads the book (on the language of the 'Koran, pp. 1-30) the student of Hebrew or Aramaic will find much that will concern him. Thus on p. 3, note 1, the problem of the vowel of the prefix in the imperfect of the *Ḳal* is adverted to. Nöldeke is of the opinion that it is not the dialectal *i* which is met with almost exclusively in the cognate languages that calls for an explanation, but rather the *a* in Hijāzic *nadkuru* and in Hebrew יָקֹם, יָסֵב. Similarly Nöldeke expressed himself in *WZKM.*, IX (1895), 16, note 1; he believes that in primitive Semitic both *i* and *a* were used, though in consequence of the operation of analogy (*Ausgleichungen*) it is difficult to establish their original spheres. Contrast Barth, *ZDMG.*, XLVIII (1894), 4-6, and Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, I (1908), 560 f. (the latter's strictures against Ungnad, *ZDMG.*, LIX (1905), 766, may be met by the explanation that the imperfect of *fa'ula* verbs was subsequently assimilated to that of *fa'ila* verbs; witness the small number of *fa'ula* verbs preserved in Hebrew and comp. Lagarde, *Übersicht*, 8). The rules which the Arab grammarians (comp. Ibn Hisham, *Bānat Su'ād*, ed. Guidi, p. 92 ff.; Sibawaihi, II, p. 275 ff.; see Fleisher, *Kleinere Schriften*, I, 96 ff.; Howell, II, 11 f.) give for the permissibility of replacing *a* by *i* are borne out by Hebrew where *i* certainly manifested itself first in *fa'ila* verbs (יָקַל contrasted with יָסֵב, יָחַצַּץ by the side of יָחַמַּר; when the accent advances, יָ is replaced by יֵ : יָחַצַּץ, comp. תִּאֲרָכְנָה but יִאֲרָכְנוּ; hence the singular יַעֲצֹמוּ Exod. 1, 7 is

יַעֲצֵם; to point יַעֲצֵם on the analogy of יַעֲמֹד יַעֲמֹד is to commit a schoolboy's blunder; comp. also שִׁכְבָּה imperf. יִשְׁכַּב with Arabic *i'lam*; while קָרַב by the side of קָרַב is accommodated to *fa'ala* verbs, the rarer מָלַכִּי and the regular זָכְרָה are proper forms; the — in יִקְטֹל should not be placed on the same footing with that in יִכְבֵּד; in the former instance *i* goes back to *ü* (from *u*), comp. אָמַר by the side of אָמַר: Pinsker, מבוא, 154). Even the dialectal Arabic form *nu'buduhum* (Fleischer, *l. c.*, 98 (not 198, as Brockelmann, p. 56r; writes)) may be paralleled in Hebrew: תַּעֲבִדֶם Exod. 20, 5; Deut. 5, 9; נַעֲבִדֶם Deut. 13, 3.—In the third part of the same essay Nöldeke deals with foreign words (chiefly Hebrew and Aramaic) in the Koran to which an arbitrary or mistaken notion was given by the prophet. Thus פֹּרֶקֶן “redemption” became “revelation”; זִכּוּת “merit, virtue” assumes the meaning of “alms” (comp. on this point, however, Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 71; Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, VI, iv); מִלָּה “word” is turned to “religion”; שִׁוְרָה “row, proper order” (note 4 on p. 26 deals with שִׁוְרָה Isa. 28, 25 with which שִׁוְרָה Panamu inscription is compared) to “chapter of the Koran”; מִתְנִיתָא = מִשְׁנָה to “sentence, verse”; מַעוֹן “dwelling” to “almsgiving”; צִלִּי “pray” to “bless”; חֲנָף “ungodly” or (so in Syriac) “heathen” to “monotheist.”—Of the interesting observations in the essay on the Hebrew-Aramaic loan-words in Ethiopic I would single out the statement (p. 36, note 6) that Arabic *kāhin* was borrowed from the Aramaic (at first in the sense “priest,” so in Sinaitic inscriptions; in the time of Mohammed it came to mean “diviner”); p. 37, note 3, we learn that Hebrew כָּנַס originally meant “enter” and that the meaning “gather” which it assumed in the Mishnah was due to contamination with Aramaic כָּנַשׁ; according to p. 38, note 3, the phrases חָס לְ, חָס וְשָׁלוֹם have nothing to do with חוּס “spare”; interesting is the list of Semitic verbs meaning “throw” and then used metaphorically for “reproach, calumniate,” among them נָדַף compared with Ethiopic *gadafa* “throw,” p. 47, note 3; on p. 52, note 3, Nöldeke rejects the theory of Daiches (*JQR*, XX (1908), 637 ff.) that in a number of places in the Bible חֲרֻבוֹת is used in the sense of “castles, fortified places,”

though he admits that the sense would fit Job 3, 14 admirably and that the connection with *mihrāb* has forced itself on other scholars; “but then the text of Job is so uncertain.”—In the prefatory remarks to his essay on words with counter-sense Nöldeke acknowledges his debt to Landau, but he does not fail to add that neither the critical acumen of that scholar nor his knowledge of the “other” Semitic languages goes very far. Nöldeke follows Geiger in regarding מִתַּאב Amos 6, 8 as an intentional correction for the original מִתַּעֵב; hence it is no case of a *didd*. הִקְרִיב II Kings 16 (not 6; p. 69, note 2), 14 appears to mean “remove”; “but the text is hardly intact” (comp. Robertson Smith, *Semites*, 2d ed., 486). A grammatical *didd* underlies the employment of פָּעוּל forms in an active sense (אָחֹז Cant. 3, 8; contrast Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 122c). פְּנִימָה “within” means properly “faceward from the point of view of the god dwelling in the adyton.” Jewish אורֵתא, אורֵתא, נגהא, prop. “light,” in the sense of “evening” is a clear case of confusion of limits. An emotional counter-sense underlies Hebrew קִלְסָה, קִלְסָה “derision,” הִתְקַלַּס “deride” over against Aramaic קִלְס “praise” (but Ezek. 16, 31 seems to presuppose the latter meaning also in Hebrew). A well-known example of euphemistic counter-sense is found in סְנִי נְהוּר, סְנִי עֵינַיִם for “blind.” Nöldeke is rightly cautious in assuming the same for בֶּרֶךְ in the sense of קִלְל or נִדָּה; “if the euphemism did not proceed from the authors, then the diaskeuasts of the text are to be charged therewith.” אוֹכְלָא “food” and רְעִי “pasture” in the sense of “dung” are instances of euphemism for the sake of decency. It is gratifying to see Nöldeke accepting the Septuagintal reading חֶסֶר in Prov. 14, 34. With reference to the etymology of כִּפָּר, Nöldeke ranges himself on the side of those who assume the original meaning to have been “cover.”—The essay on nouns from biconsonantal roots is introduced by a friendly polemic against Barth and Philippi who among moderns are most pronounced in favor of the theory that the biliteralism of such nouns is only a seeming one, and that in truth they originated in triconsonantal roots; and in a footnote he discountenances the theory that all forms from “weak” roots were primitively so constituted as to reveal the weak

radicals as real consonants (to mention one example, *ṣaḥūlu* goes back to original *ṣaḥūulu*). As is well known, the problem has been much discussed. The modern biliteralist is, it is true, not to be placed beside Menahem ben Saruḥ. Still there is much common ground on which they both stand. Nöldeke himself is led by the logic of his theory to assume, if you please, roots consisting of but one consonant followed by a vowel (comp. the nouns "water," "lamb," "mouth"). It cannot be maintained that with the means at our disposal the problem is any nearer a definitive solution than it ever was. Either theory is plausible as far as it goes, and either has its insurmountable difficulties. I cannot share Nöldeke's opinion that the old doctrine of Gesenius is for practical purposes the easier one. The Ewald-Müller-Wellhausen method (let it be so named rather than theory) has great practical advantages. The intricacies of the three classes (ע"י, ע"ו, ע"ע) are much more easily taken hold of by the learner if we adopt their method. But, regrettable though it may be, the method breaks down in certain particulars. If יָקֹם and יָסַב preserve the characteristic stem-vowel, why is the reverse the case in יָסַב, יָקֹם? Certainly יָסַב is more easy of explanation if we assume contraction (= *insabibu*); יָקֹם may then have been formed direct from יָסַב by lengthening the vowel which was retained. Again, the full forms, comp. e. g. סָבַב (*fārr-un* is apparently a late formation, comp. עָלִין in biblical Aramaic), seem to favor the contraction theory; the long vowel makes the contraction impossible in early Semitic at any rate where long vowels were impossible in closed (hence geminate) syllables. As for the nouns, it is certainly conceivable that when *bina-n* was phonetically developed out of *binaṭ-un* it might be misconceived as *bin-an* and thus lead to *bin-un*. Nöldeke, it is true, does not go as far as Stade; but even his smaller list is open to discussion. The tendency to shift the forms from one class to another is no more than what we find in all forms from the so-called weak roots. Ultimately it is perhaps a question of root-formation (basic theme and determinants). On p. 123 there is a slight error in detail. וְיִנְיָם cannot be a pausal form. On an earlier occasion (*ZDMG.*, XXXVII (1883), 540) Nöldeke pronounced וְיִנְיָם Jerem. 16, 16

a Piel form. That is certainly correct; it is gratifying to see that herein Nöldeke agrees with Ibn Janāḥ (*s. v.*; Ibn Janāḥ, by the way, rightly accounts for the absence of the dagesh by comparing בִּקְשׁוּ; comp. also כִּימִי).—It has long been recognized that in certain instances פ"נ and פ"ו roots are closely related. One need only think of נַצַּב (comp. Aramaic and Arabic نَضَب "plant, establish" and Hebrew מַצְבֵּה by the side of הַתִּצַּב). The transition of the one consonant into the other cannot be a matter of phonetics. Some פ"נ roots clearly have their origin in the N stem of a biconsonantal root. But it cannot be maintained that it is the case universally. Nöldeke would not go so far as to postulate on the basis of parallel forms with dagesh (אַצְרָה by the side of וַיִּצָּר e. g.) parallel פ"נ roots; the very oscillation of the authors of the punctuation should put one on his guard. On the other hand, he cannot understand why הִצִּיג and הִצִּית should not be derived from נָצַג, נָצַח. The ketib form II Sam. 14, 30 is no clue; "how bad our Samuel text is is well known."—The long recognized interchange of initial ו and י in Hebrew is usually viewed as a phonetic phenomenon. But it cannot be maintained that Hebrew really shows an aversion to initial ו: comp. וָ "pin, peg"; post-biblical וְחִיק "careful," etc. Nor can it be said that after a prefix closing with a consonant י is impossible; comp. by the side of הַתּוֹרַע a form like הַתִּילָר. Nöldeke seems to incline to the opinion that from the very beginning there existed parallel roots with ו and י.—Proceeding from the observation that what is called a participle in Semitic (*fā'il-un* e. g.) is really an adjective or noun, Nöldeke approaches the problem of the Hebrew participles like קָם, etc. Some are intransitive and might recall the adjectives of the type *fā'al* (קָטַן, חָכָם, etc.); but there are also transitives. בּוֹשִׁים Ezek. 32 30 goes well enough with the perf. בּוֹשׂ (קוֹמִים) II Kings 16, 7 is pronounced an error of transcription; בָּחֹלָה Jerem. 4, 31 was taken by the authors of the vocalization as "sick"; read בָּחֹלָה; but there is no necessity to put the accent on the penultimate with Nöldeke), but טוֹב is Aramaic טָב. While מָת goes well with

the perfect מִת, no such parallelism obtains in the case of לִיז, יָר, etc. The קָם forms are peculiar to Hebrew; nevertheless Nöldeke gives a list of Arabic adjectives of the type *rāh-un* "windy." The problem is really only stated, not solved. With a view to the participles of the N stem (נִקְטָל by the side of נִקְטֵל) the view which Nöldeke mentions in the first place only to reject it may still have something in its favor.—Whether the positions assumed by Nöldeke will meet with universal assent or not, the book is so replete with erudition and sound judgment that no student of the Hebrew or Aramaic language can fail to learn much from the great master of Semitic philology. The grain of scepticism which permeates the book may be welcomed as a check upon all the extravagant theories to be met with elsewhere. "I seek," says the learned author in the Preface, "above all to establish facts, and as for matters which it is really impossible to know, I venture at the most modest conjectures. I leave it to bolder investigators to determine how the characteristic forms of the Semitic languages were developed both phonetically and semantically from their pre-Semitic antecedents. It is an easy matter to construct beautiful systems of linguistic "Prähistorie," but the question always remains whether the real process was not after all a totally different one."

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. As edited and enlarged by the late E. KAUTZSCH, Professor of theology in the University of Halle. Second English edition. Revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition (1909) by A. E. COWLEY. With a facsimile of the Siloam inscription by J. Euting, and a table of alphabets by M. Lidzbarski. Oxford: at the CLARENDON PRESS, 1910. pp. xvi + 598.

Hebräische Grammatik. Mit Übungsbuch. Von Prof. HERMANN L. STRACK, der Theologie und Philosophie Doctor. Zehnte und elfte, sorgfältig verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. (*Clavis linguarum Semiticarum.* Edidit HERMANN L. STRACK. Pars I.) München: C. H. BECK'SCHE VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG (OSCAR BECK), 1911. pp. xii + 159 + 128.*

Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Mit den nach Handschriften berichtigten Texten und einem Wörterbuch. Von Prof. D. Dr.

The Hebrew and German exercises are well chosen and graded; helps are afforded for the study of texts not incorporated in the manual; a short and useful glossary completes the volume. Attention is also paid to the training in reading unpointed texts; one such text is derived from Mapu's *אמון פרנני*. Strack calls attention to Baer's *Tikkun* which may be had for the price of one mark and which will be more than serviceable for the purposes of reading unvocalized texts.—Strack's Manual of the Biblical Aramaic is equally a splendid piece of work both from the theoretical and practical point of view. The cognate matter from the Egyptian Aramaic (chiefly on the basis of the Assuan publication) has been faithfully registered. Both in this book and in the Hebrew Grammar there is a full bibliography which is singularly up-to-date. The Aramaic texts have been revised after a large number of manuscripts; of those with superlinear vocalization full specimens are given. There is also a useful glossary. Surely there will be no room for the regrettable phenomenon recorded by the learned author that out of a hundred German theologians ninety are unacquainted with the biblical Aramaic. A better text-book and a less expensive (the price of the bound volume is but M. 2.50) there is certainly none, if only the will to learn exists.

Dropsie College

MAX L. MARGOLIS